THE
Dan Smoot Report

Vol. 16, No. 41 (Broadcast 790) October 12, 1970 Dallas, Texas

DAN SMOOT

ISRAEL AND THE HAWKISH DOVES

On September 29, 1970, the House of Representatives, by a vote of 341 to 11, passed a $19.9 billion defense procurement bill which included a provision *restricting Presidential authority* to build the Safeguard antiballistic missile defense system to protect the United States. The bill had another provision granting *unlimited Presidential authority* to supply Israel whatever arms she may ask for, short of nuclear weapons. On October 1, the Senate — with only about a dozen members present — gave final approval to the bill, by voice vote. J. William Fulbright was the only Senator who voted against the measure.[1]

Probably, Fulbright's reason for this vote was that the bill gave the Pentagan too much spending authority. Certainly, Fulbright did not vote against the bill because it restricted the President's authority to provide for the defense of the United States while giving him unlimited authority to provide for the defense of Israel.

Fulbright is a leader in the group of Senators now often called "doves," "radical liberals," "neo-isolationists," "disarmament pacifists." Other prominent Senators in the group are Edward M. Kennedy, Mike Mansfield, Eugene McCarthy, George McGovern, Charles Goodell, Jacob Javits. These are the men who generally oppose adequate defense for the United States, but ardently approve defense of Israel.

"Dawks," the neo-isolationist radical liberals are sometimes called, because they are cooing "doves" on Vietnam, raucous "hawks" on Israel. But their strange ambivalence and contradictions go deeper than that.

Many Members of Congress now known as "neo-isolationists" were among the most clamorous who clamored for an end to the traditional American foreign policy of benign neutrality (called "isolationism"). They gave (and still give) unstinting support to an internationalist foreign policy based on

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT is published weekly by The Dan Smoot Report, Inc., Box 9538, Dallas, Texas 75214 (office at 6441 Gaston Ave.). Subscriptions: $22.00 for 2 years; $12.00, 1 year; $7.00, 6 months. Dan Smoot was born in Missouri, reared in Texas. With BA and MA degrees from SMU (1938 and 1940), he joined the Harvard faculty (1941) as a Teaching Fellow, doing graduate work in American civilization. From 1942 to 1951, he was an FBI agent; from 1951 to 1955, a commentator on national radio and television. In 1955, he started his present independent, free-enterprise business: publishing this REPORT and abbreviating it each week for radio and TV broadcasts available for commercial sponsorship by business firms.

Copyright by Dan Smoot, 1970. Second Class mail privilege authorized at Dallas, Texas.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

U.S. membership in the United Nations. This internationalist policy, formulated in the latter days of the Roosevelt administration, has committed the U.S. to involvement in the affairs of all other nations on earth, not only by giving economic and military aid, but also, in many instances, by defending other nations with our own troops.

For years, the men now known as "neo-isolationists" were contemptuous of "isolationists" — "isolationists" being Americans who cherished our traditional foreign policy, and warned that internationalist meddling in the political and military affairs of other nations would keep us perpetually involved in foreign wars; would keep us so heavily committed abroad that we could not manage our domestic affairs; and would eventually change our independent constitutional Republic into a province of one-world socialist-communist government. The neo-isolationists are still contemptuous of isolationists. Yet, they are now saying what isolationists have been saying all along: the U.S. is too heavily committed abroad and cannot play the role of world policeman.

Members of Congress who are now doves on Vietnam did everything in their power to get us in the Vietnam war. They not only approved the general interventionist policy that makes foreign wars inevitable for us; but they also supported the specific commitments and actions that dragged us into Vietnam: Eisenhower's SEATO treaty of 1955, pledging us to defend Southeast Asia; Kennedy's intrigues involving the Diem government of South Vietnam and his escalation of a small group of American military advisers into a sizeable American fighting force; Johnson's Tonkin Gulf Resolution of 1964, authorizing unlimited American involvement. Yet, when communists seized upon our no-win involvement in the Vietnam war as a rich source of propaganda to discredit us as a military power and as a people, U.S. radical-liberal doves sided with the communists. Presidents Johnson and Nixon both rejected military victory as an objective of our war with communists in Vietnam. But that was not enough for the doves in Congress. What they have been advocating during the past four years amounts to American surrender to the communists.

Senator J. William Fulbright, leading Senate dove on Vietnam, has made the hawkish proposal that the U.S. formally pledge itself by treaty to protect Israel's borders, even if this requires use of American troops.[2]

Fulbright made this proposal as a way to promote world peace, of course. By threatening to use enough military power to protect Israel, no matter how much power it takes, we will prevent aggressions against Israel. And that will cause peace. Congressional doves do not have the same attitude about defending the United States, however. They do not want to maintain enough military power to insure us against aggression. With regard to defense of the United States, they are disarmament pacifists.

But they are not disarmament pacifists with regard to the Soviet Union.

During the 1950's and early 1960's, when the U.S. had military superiority over the Soviets, disarmament liberals claimed that our superiority was a danger to world peace because it made the Soviets feel insecure; and the feeling of insecurity made the Soviets truculent. Hence, the U.S. should reduce its military power, while the Soviets increased theirs. This would ease tensions, bring about a balance of power, and promote world peace.[3] Yet, disarmament liberals who feared the imbalance of military power, when we were up and the Soviets down, have displayed no fear of it since the Soviets began overtaking and surpassing us in military power.

Far from being afraid of Soviet military superiority, disarmament liberals seem to welcome it. They now want further disarming of the United States as a show of trust and good faith which might encourage the Soviet Union to enter a strategic-arms-limitation agreement with us. Apparently, they have overlooked the historical record which reveals that the Soviets have never, in 37 years, honored an important agreement with us.

In the late 1950's and early 1960's, the Soviets, violating agreements with us, made nuclear-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

weapons tests which enabled them to develop and install defensive systems to protect their homeland against U.S. ballistic missiles. Honoring the agreements which the Soviets were violating, the U.S. government refrained from developing an anti-ballistic-missiles defense for the American homeland.[4] Disarmament liberals in the U.S. Congress seemed quite unconcerned about this condition which was (and is) big with danger for the United States. But they are deeply concerned about present efforts to provide the American homeland a modicum of protection against ballistic missiles. They say that preparations to defend ourselves will offend the Soviets because it will demonstrate that we do not trust them.

Our internationalist foreign policy — built on foreign aid "to help ourselves by helping others" — has led us into many dangerous straits. Korea and Vietnam are two of them. Another, and potentially the most dangerous of all, is in Palestine.

Palestine, a region about the size of New Hampshire at the southeastern end of the Mediterranean, is the Canaan or Promised Land to which Moses led the children of Israel from Egypt. For a brief period at the beginning of the tenth century B.C., all of Palestine was a Jewish nation. Following the reign of King David, war between the tribes of Israel severed the Jewish nation in Palestine into two Hebrew kingdoms known as Israel and Judah. Assyrians conquered Israel in 722 B.C. Babylonians conquered Judah in 587 B.C.

The last remnant of a Jewish state was gone from the land of Palestine, and so were most of the Jews. In the second century B.C., the Maccabees established a new Jewish nation in Palestine; but it lasted only 79 years. For the next 2000 years, Palestine was a province or protectorate of various empires. Its inhabitants for most of that time were largely Arabs.

Palestine is, in fact, the heart of the Arab homeland. Throughout the Middle Ages (and afterward), when there was harsh hostility between Christians and Jews in the Christian nations of Europe, Jews and Arabs got along well together. The relatively few Jews who sought refuge in Palestine and other Arab lands were welcome.

Conflict between Arabs and Jews began in the late nineteenth century when the movement known as zionism was formally launched. The zionist claim was that Palestine is historically Jewish land. Its purpose was to colonize Palestine with enough alien Jews from Europe, Asia, and America to take the land away from Arabs and create a Jewish political state.

What if a small group of people from Asia, Europe, and Africa, laid claim to the entire Western Hemisphere, basing their claim on their own assertion that they are the descendants of Indians who possessed the Hemisphere long ago but vanished 2000 years before the white man ever arrived? Their claim would be on a par with the zionist claim that Palestine belongs to alien Jews who wish to go there.

Simultaneously with the emergence of zionism, a strong sense of nationalism was developing among Arabs in Palestine. For many centuries they had lived there, but always under the rule of a foreign power. They wanted national independence.

When World War I began (1914), Palestine was a province of the Turkish empire. The Turks were allies of Germany. Arab guerrilla forces helped the British fight the Turks, because the British had promised to support Arab national independence in Palestine (and in other Arab lands). But the British also promised to support establishment of a "National Home for the Jewish People" in Palestine. This British deal with zionists was made, not because of any military assistance Jews could give in Palestine, but because of the enormous wealth, power, and influence of world Jewry, especially in the United States.

Thus zionism and Arab nationalism were put on a collision course in Palestine.

In the interval between World War I and World War II, Palestine was a British protectorate. Hostility between Arabs and Jews had developed; but, prior to the mid-1930's, it did not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

amount to much because there were not many Jews there.

Nazism in Germany, however, stimulated large-scale Jewish migration to Palestine. By 1935, European Jews were moving into Palestine at a rate of more than 60,000 a year.

Hostility between Arabs and Jews deepened into violent hatred. Both Arabs and Jews formed guerrilla bands. When Arab guerrillas committed atrocities or acts of terrorism against Jews, Jewish guerrillas retaliated in kind.

Conflict subsided in the latter part of 1939 when German military power in North Africa became a threat to the entire Middle East.

Defeat of the German army at El Alamein on November 3, 1942, put an end to the German threat. Almost immediately, a secret Jewish army was formed in Palestine, armed with weapons stolen from the British. Bands of Jewish guerrillas spread death and terror throughout the Arab population. Arabs retaliated.

Before World War II ended, zionists were putting heavy pressure on American politicians to support zionist aims in Palestine; but President Franklin D. Roosevelt said that a Jewish state in Palestine could be established and maintained only by military force. On April 5, 1945, President Roosevelt wrote a letter to the King of Saudi Arabia, confirming an earlier personal promise that the U.S. would not support the zionist aim of establishing a Jewish state in Palestine. Roosevelt's State Department and his Joint Chiefs of Staff urged this stand on Roosevelt because: (1) the oil and strategic location of the Middle East made the area vital to U.S. interests; (2) Arab people, numbering more than 100 million, and their governments were traditionally friendly toward the U.S.; (3) U.S. support for a Jewish state in Palestine would alienate Arabs and drive them into the Soviet orbit.

President Harry Truman could not resist zionist pressures. On May 14, 1948, zionists proclaimed that the State of Israel existed. Eleven minutes after this proclamation was made in Palestine, the White House in Washington announced formal U.S. recognition of the new nation.

Ever since, our government has supported Israel no matter what she does, and much that she has done has been grossly damaging to American interests.

Our support of the socialist state of Israel with a population of 2.5 million (most of whom are immigrants from other countries), has turned the Arab world (with a population of more than 100 million) from pro-American to pro-Soviet.[5]

While causing Arab hatred of us by helping Israel, however, we have also been trying fruitlessly to buy back Arab friendship, with billions in gifts and loans.

It was tragically wrong for us to get involved in the Middle Eastern mess in the first place. But, having made the error, must we perpetuate it?

NEXT WEEK: More on this, and other aspects of American foreign aid

FOOTNOTES

(1) UPI, Sept. 30 and Oct. 2, 1970
(2) Los Angeles Times news service, Aug. 23, 1970
(3) *Dan Smoot Report*, 1961 Bound Volume, pp. 313-320, 330-331, 345, 396; 1962 Bound Volume, pp. 97-104; 1963 Bound Volume, pp. 137-160
(4) "The Test Ban Treaty," *Dan Smoot Report*, 1963 Bound Volume, pp. 241-248
(5) Information on the ancient and modern history of Palestine is from four Reports on Israel, Jan. 20 and 27 and Feb. 3 and 10, 1969. Reprints of the four-part series on Israel, giving details and sources of information, are still available as a set for 75 cents. They are also available in the 1969 Bound Volume of *The Dan Smoot Report*.

Subscribe Today to The Dan Smoot Report

6 mos. $7.00 **– 1 YR. $12.00 –** 2 yrs. $22.00

THE DAN SMOOT REPORT
BOX 9538, DALLAS, TEXAS 75214
Telephone: TAylor 1-2303

Send reprints to your friends and suggest they order reprints too.
REPRINTS OF THIS ISSUE (for bulk mailing to one address):

1 copy	$ .25	50 copies	$ 5.50
6 copies	1.00	100 copies	10.00
25 copies	3.50	1000 copies	90.00

Texans Add 4¼% for Sales Tax
(Add 50c for special-handling postage)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED